

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 11-23 are in the application.

Claims 1, 5, 8, 13, 14, and 17 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventions.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 11, 20, and 21 are amended to provide consistent antecedent basis.

Claims 9 and 10 are cancelled by this amendment.

New dependent claims 22 and 23 are added by this amendment.

Objection to the drawings:

The drawings were objected to for not showing the "updating system". This objection is respectfully traversed. The specification states on page 10, lines 11-17 that "In other words, an event driven updating system is employed through the use of LOG, directory servers 58-62, SQL connection server 64 and SQL server 56 to maintain synchronization of data residing within security system 57" All of these elements, directory servers 58-62, SQL connection server 64 and SQL server 56, are shown in FIG. 2. Thus the updating system is shown in FIG. 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

First 35 USC 112 Rejection:

Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 USC 112 for failing to comply with the written description because the use of the terms internal and external information. It is believed that the amendments to claim 13 now overcome this rejection. The amendment to claim 13 particularly points out the location of the internal and external information.

Additionally, the specification discloses at least on page 10, line 31 through page 11, line 4, (among other places in the specification) that users of a System of Record are able to manipulate data contained within the database of directory 46 through directory webserver 48 and 50. On page 11, lines 17-32

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

it is disclosed that the updated information from the financial system of record is imported back into directory 46 through import data server 54. Thus the "external" data from the financial system of record is imported back into the internal database of directory 46. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art can readily distinguish between internal and external information. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 USC 112 is now overcome by the amendments to claim 13.

Second 35 USC 112 Rejection;

Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 USC 112 for being indefinite. The Office Action indicated that it was not clear what was meant by "internal and external information" in claim 13 and why the method would use the difference information. It is believed that the amendments to claim 13 now overcome this rejection. Additionally, the claims are not a technical description, thus, it is not the purpose of the claims to point out "why" a particular piece of information is used, the specification provides the technical description. Further, the terms "internal information" and "external information" as used in amended claim 13 are nouns used to identify one piece of information from the other piece of information and that the location is provided by the additional amended wording. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claim 13 now overcome this 35 USC 112 rejection.

First 35 USC 103 Rejection:

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. patent no. 6,324,587 issued to Trenbeath et al in view of U.S. patent no. 6,304,860 issued to Martin et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' amended claim 1 calls for, among other things, the updating system having a central directory including a first database that includes data associated with the data objects

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

wherein the data within the central directory is accessible by the system of record, the central directory, and a security system external to the central directory, the security system containing a second database that includes a portion of the data of the first database wherein the second database is updated from the first database at the predetermined intervals.

The combined relied on references do not teach or suggest and in fact are silent on a central directory with a database that includes the data associated with the data objects. Additionally, both references are silent on a security system external to the central directory and silent on the security system having a second database that is updated at the predetermined intervals. The combined relied on references can not teach or suggest that on which both references are silent. Note that applicants are not claiming to have invented the concept of updating at predetermined intervals, but are merely using this as one step in a combination of steps for the method. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that when claim 1 is examined as a whole including all of the limitations, that it is not made obvious by the combined relied on references.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Second 35 USC 103 rejection:

Claims 5-9 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. patent no. 6,324,587 issued to Trenbeath et al in view of U.S. patent no. 5,706,509 issued to Tso. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' amended claim 5 includes, among other features, a central directory having the first storage area and coupled to receive the first data objects and coupled to store the data objects into the first storage area wherein the plurality of devices have access to information stored within the central directory, a security system external to the central directory,

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

the security system having the second storage area that includes the second data objects wherein the second data objects include at least a portion of information that is also within the first data objects, and wherein the update system modifies the second data objects at predetermined intervals.

Both of the combined relied on references are silent on a central directory having the first storage area wherein the plurality of devices have access to the information within the central directory. Also the combined relied on references do not teach or suggest a security system external to the central directory and having a second storage area and that includes a portion of the information within the first data object. Additionally the combined relied on references do not teach or suggest updating the second objects at predetermined intervals. When these limitations are taken with claim 5 as a whole, the combined relied on references do not teach or suggest the combination of steps called for by claim 5. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the relied on references are deficient in making obvious claim 5.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

Applicants amended claim 8 includes the steps of forming a central directory having a first database having information including financial information and also including employee information, providing a financial system of record external to the central directory wherein the financial system of record has access to the financial information within the central directory, providing a human resources system of record external to the central directory wherein the human resources system of record has access to the employee information within the central directory, providing a security system external to the central directory wherein the security system includes at least a portion of the employee information, editing a first data object of the

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

information in one of the financial system or the human resources system, and synchronizing the second data object with the portion of the employee information within the security system. At least these combination of elements are not taught or suggested by the combined references.

The combined relied on references do not teach or suggest at least the combination of a central directory that has financial and employee information, financial and human resource systems external to the central directory that have access to the information, a security system external to the central directory, and synchronizing the employee information with the second data object. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combined relied on references can not make obvious claim 8.

Claims 9 and 10 are cancelled, thus, the rejection thereof is now moot.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 8 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

Amended claim 13 calls for, among other features, storing a set of internal information in a first database within a central directory, receiving a set of external information from a system of record external to the central directory, and synchronizing the difference information with a set of security information within a second database within a security system wherein the security information is used to provide employee ingress and egress procedures. The combined relied on references do not teach or suggest using a central directory to store information. Further, the combination does not teach or suggest receiving data from external to the central directory and then synchronizing information with security information in another database external to the central directory. The combined relied references also do not teach or suggest using the security

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

information to provide ingress and egress procedures. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is not made obvious by the combined relied on references.

Claims 14-16 depend from claim 13 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13.

Third 35 USC 103 Rejection:

Claims 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. patent no. 6,158,007 issued to Moreh et al in view of U.S. patent no. 6,324,587 issued to Trenbeath et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' amended claim 17 includes, among other limitations, entering data associated with a new employee into a first database within a central directory, adding the data associated with the new employee to an updating function of the information management system including adding the data associated with the new employee to employee security information stored within a second database that is within a security system wherein the security system is external to the central directory and provides ingress and egress procedures. The combined relied on references do not teach or suggest at least these combinations of steps.

The combined relied on references are silent on entering the employee data into a central database and then adding the data to a second database within a security system external to the central directory and wherein the security system provides ingress and egress procedures. Note that the security system of Moreh et al merely is information used to determine message flow. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 can not be made obvious by the combined relied on references.

Claims 18-21 depend from claim 17 and are believed to be

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

Fourth 35 USC 103 Rejection:

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. patent no. 6,324,587 issued to Trenbeath et al. in view of U.S. patent no. 5,706,509 issued to Tso and further in view of U.S. patent no. 5,995,105 issued to Reber et al. Claim 10 is cancelled by this amendment, thus, the rejection thereof is now moot.

New claim 22 depends from claim 13 and is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13. Additionally, claim-22 includes receiving information from a financial system and receiving information from a human resources system. The combined relied on references do not teach or suggest using such a combination of systems. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 can not be made obvious by the combination of the Trenbeath et al and Tso references.

New claim 23 depends from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, claim 23 includes the first database having financial data and employee data. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 can not be made obvious by the combination of the Trenbeath et al and Martin et al references.

The references cited but not relied upon were reviewed and are believed not to make obvious applicants' invention.

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969


CONCLUSION

Applicants made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of all of the above, it is believed that applicants' claims are allowable, and that the case is now in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

By this amendment, two dependent claims are cancelled and two dependent claims were added, thus, it is believed that no fees are due for this amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-1086.

If there are matters which can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this Application, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney/agent at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,
William Ender et al



ON Semiconductor
Law Dept./MD A700
P.O. Box 62890
Phoenix, AZ 85082-2890

Robert F. Hightower
Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 36163
Tel. (602) 244-5603